

University and College Union

Carlow Street, London NW1 7LH, Tel. 020 7756 2500, www.ucu.org.uk

To Branch and local association secretaries

Topic **unconfirmed minutes, HE special sector conference on USS Dispute**

Action **for adoption; to note**

Contact Paul Bridge, Head of Higher Education (Christine Bernabe, Head Office Administrator/minutes)

Higher Education Special Sector Conference:

USS Dispute : Decisions

Thursday 21 June 2018, The King's House Conference Centre, Manchester

1 Welcome / Opening remarks

- 1.1 Douglas Chalmers, Chair welcomed all delegates and called conference to order. Housekeeping matters were noted. Conference agreed UCU Regional Officials will assume the role of tellers.

2 CBC report

- 2.1 Martin Levy CBC moved the CBC report and agenda which had been made available at conference.
- 2.2 The CBC agenda to HESSC was challenged. Speakers in the debate were Bruce Baker (Newcastle University) and Eleni Michalopoulou (University of Liverpool).
- 2.3 CBC responded to the challenges.
- 2.4 The following challenges to the CBC report were put to the vote and decisions were noted:
- 2.5 The challenge to put motions A, C, D and E back on the agenda was approved and conference **accepted** these motions will be taken after motion 9.
- 2.6 The proposal to put amendment 4A.1 back on the agenda (Bruce Baker, Newcastle University) was **carried**.
- 2.7 The University of Leeds proposal to withdraw G was **accepted** by conference:
- 2.8 *G. Campaigning for DB pensions as the best social pension provision, University of Leeds (motion 20) the public university and academic freedom*

(Part of motion considered to be out of order and not appropriate for debate as it would be deemed to be defamatory)

- 2.9 Eleni Michalopoulou proposed to further challenge G. A vote taken in favour of the challenge to G was LOST.
- 2.10 The challenge to put back H back on the agenda was removed.
- 2.11 Motion F was not placed on the agenda.

3 Debate of motions

Motion 1, Scrutiny of the Joint Expert Panel, University of Liverpool was moved by David Whyte, University of Liverpool.

An amendment also put by the mover following the debate, to delete in point 1 'should take place in October 2018, at the annual conference in May 2019 and' **was CARRIED**. Other speakers on this motion were Joe Gluza (University of Cambridge), Joanna de Groot (HEC, University of York), Michelle Huws-Thomas (Cardiff University)

This motion was subsequently CARRIED AS AMENDED :

Conference notes that a clear mechanism of reporting to the membership will strengthen the power of our representatives on the JEP.

Conference demands that the national union establishes a standing meeting of HE delegates to scrutinise the work of the JEP.

- 1. This meeting should follow the same bi-annual pattern until the membership (through a consultative ballot) agree that a satisfactory resolution to the dispute has been agreed.*
- 2. Following each HE meeting, a consultative ballot should be held within 2 weeks of the meeting to establish if the membership is satisfied with progress.*
- 3. The wording of the consultative ballot should be agreed by emergency motion at the HESC meeting.*
- 4. Should the consultative ballot indicate that members are not happy with progress, the union will reopen its dispute with UUK.*

Motion 2, JEP and USS Campaign, University of Leicester was moved by David Harvie, University of Leicester. The motion was opposed by Kamie Kitmitto (University of Manchester). **The motion was CARRIED :**

This HESC believes:

Our ability to protect our pensions ultimately relies upon our willingness to restart our strike action.

If, following receipt of the JEP report, UUK/USS agrees to increase members' contributions or to cuts in benefits then this is unacceptable to UCU.

This HESC resolves:

- 1. To continue campaigning for no cuts in benefits or increases in our contributions in our pensions.*
- 2. If UUK/USS, on receipt of the JEP report, threaten cuts in benefits or increases in our contributions, UCU will organise an industrial action ballot, timed to ensure we can strike before the end of the second semester of the academic year and to continue into the summer exam and graduation period.*

Motion 3, JEP and national dispute committee, University College London was moved by Sean Wallis (HEC, University College London) was not opposed and **was CARRIED :**

Conference notes HE13 calling for a national dispute committee for the USS dispute which will have inter alia the task of scrutinising the work of the Joint Expert Panel (JEP).

Conference therefore agrees that UCU contact with the JEP and its chair must include reports to the national dispute committee.

Conference calls on the JEP to require new valuations of the 2017 round which:

1. abandon Test 1, Test 2, Test 3 and combinations of these;
2. assume no de-risking of any kind.

Conference further calls on the JEP to:

- a. explain the valuation assumptions that have been used, and their sources;
- b. produce illustrative calculations showing what happens when those assumptions are varied.

Motion 4, Transparency and the USS Joint Expert Panel, University of Cambridge was moved by Susanne Hakenbeck, University of Cambridge. Geoff Fowler (Sunderland University) moved **amendment 4A.1**, (which had been placed on the agenda following a challenge to the CBC report). **This amendment was carried:**

Motion 4A.1 Transparency and the USS Joint Expert Panel, University of Cambridge, Newcastle University

Add to Conference notes:

4. the use of non-disclosure agreements in the JEP.

Add to Conference Resolves:

- d. to call for the withdrawal of non-disclosure agreements and instruct our USS negotiators to refuse to agree to confidentiality agreements.

Motion 4 was CARRIED AS AMENDED by 4A.1

Conference notes:

1. that satisfactory recommendations from the UCU-UUK Joint Expert Panel (JEP) are crucial to acceptable resolution of the USS dispute;
2. that the lack of transparency severely undermined confidence in the 2017 USS valuation process;
3. that the current Terms of Reference make both submitted evidence and discussions among the JEP confidential.
4. the use of non-disclosure agreements in the JEP

Conference resolves:

That UCU will accept any JEP recommendations as authoritative only if accessible and convincing explanations of the following are provided:

- a. the evidence and reasoning by which any Scheme deficit or surplus is calculated by the JEP, in light of the high level of actual investment returns;
- b. the evidence and reasoning used by the JEP to estimate of the strength of the employer covenant;
- c. the evidence and reasoning underlying the JEP's calculation of the contribution rates needed to fund various levels and types of future defined benefits.
- d. to call for the withdrawal of non-disclosure agreements and instruct our USS negotiators to refuse to agree to confidentiality agreements

Other speakers in the debate included Renee Prendergast (HEC, Queen's University Belfast), Wendy Olsen (University of Manchester), Andrew Chitty (University of Sussex), Sam

Morecroft (University of Sheffield). Mike Lammiman (University of Hull) raised a point of order to ask questions which spoke against the motion.

Motion 5, JEP (Joint Expert Panel): regular reporting and submissions from members, University of Oxford, moved by Jaya John John (University of Oxford) was not opposed and **CARRIED** :

Conference notes the very welcome first statement from Joanne Segars OBE, chair of the Joint Expert Panel, in particular, that the JEP will:

1. provide regular reports about the JEP's progress and the issues discussed,
2. explain clearly the evidence serving as the basis for recommendations,
3. accept submissions from USS members on all relevant issues.

Conference reaffirms the importance of these undertakings.

Conference also notes motion HE47 carried at HESC 2018 which mandates Superannuation Working Group members to agree regular reporting and feedback mechanisms with UCU appointed members of JEP.

Building on these, Conference mandates the SWG to negotiate that the JEP will report to members following each meeting of the JEP.

Motion 6, Joint Expert Panel (JEP), University College London was moved by Saladin Meckled-Garcia (University College London). Speakers in the debate were Matthew Green (University of Nottingham), Kamie Kitmitto (University of Manchester), Justine Mercer (HEC, Midlands – HE). In response to a question asked, Paul Bridge, Head of HE clarified the official secretariat of JEP and process of contact. **This motion was subsequently CARRIED** :

Conference welcomes the setting up of the JEP and the motions of the recent HE Sector Conference about its work.

Conference agrees that UCU contact with the JEP and its chair should involve all the elected lay negotiators and not just the General Secretary.

Conference instructs the negotiators to:

1. Investigate the use of any surplus to improve pensions for members on casualised contracts, at the start of their careers and in equality strands. One approach would be a reduction in contributions while maintaining benefits.
2. Publicise any refusal, delay or conditionality by USS upon releasing information to JEP.
3. Encourage members to make submissions to JEP.
4. Arrange for a dedicated area of UCU website to be set up for JEP information and reports.

Motion 7, USS JEP, University of Leeds, was moved by Lesley McGorrigan, University of Leeds. A point of order was raised from the floor by Sam Marsh (University of Sheffield) on consequential about the motion in relation to motion C, which was clarified by CBC. *Tony Brown (UCL) proposed that point 4 of the motion be split in two parts and voted on separately. This was accepted by conference. Ryan Prout (Cardiff University) proposed a drafting amendment from the floor, to add the word 'if' in the second sentence of the first paragraph between the words 'even' and 'superior'. This was agreed by conference.*

The first part of point 4 'oppose replacing the USS DB scheme scheme with a CDC scheme' **was carried.** **The latter part of point 4** 'although a CDC scheme might form part of a top-up scheme for those earning over the cap in the current capped DB scheme' **was lost.**

This motion was subsequently CARRIED AS AMENDED (amendments put from the floor) :

Conference notes the Joint Expert Panel (JEP) could recommend a Collective Defined Contribution (CDC) scheme to replace the current USS Defined Benefit (DB) scheme. Conference believes CDC schemes are considerably inferior to established DB schemes, even if superior to individual DC plans.

Conference agrees UCU contact with the JEP and its chair should involve all our elected lay negotiators.

Conference instructs our negotiators to:

- 1. publicise any refusal, delays or conditionality by USS upon releasing information to JEP;*
- 2. encourage members to make submissions to JEP;*
- 3. arrange a dedicated UCU website section for JEP information and reports;*
- 4. oppose replacing the USS DB scheme with a CDC scheme.*
- 5. pursue measures for improving pension arrangements for members on lower incomes, in the early career stage, on casualised contracts, and in equality strands.*

Motion 8, Joint Expert Panel, University of Glasgow, was moved by Richard Reeve, University of Glasgow. Justine Mercer (HEC, Midlands – HE) also spoke in the debate and raised a point of information. **The motion was subsequently CARRIED :**

Conference welcomes the setting up of the JEP and the motions of the recent HE Sector Conference about its work.

Conference agrees that UCU contact with the JEP should follow the agreed processes and that all outcomes should be publicised to members.

Conference instructs HEC to:

- 1. Publicise any refusal, unreasonable delays or conditionality by USS upon releasing information to JEP.*
- 2. Encourage members to make submissions to JEP.*
- 3. Arrange for a dedicated area of UCU website to be set up for JEP information and reports.*

Conference instructs the negotiators to:

- a. Investigate the use of any surplus to improve pensions for members on casualised*

contracts, at the start of their careers and in equality strands. One approach would be a reduction in contributions while maintaining benefits.

Motion 9, Questions we require the Joint Experts Panel to answer, University of Warwick was moved by Dennis Leech, University of Warwick. **This motion was not opposed and CARRIED :**

We ask the JEP to:

- 1. Explain in simple terms by what process exactly does it go from being cash flow positive, with an annual surplus of £1bn, to deficit.*
- 2. Provide projections of future income and benefit payments, updating the indicative ones made for UCU by First Actuarial that suggest it may be perfectly sustainable indefinitely without changes.*
- 3. Conduct a new analysis of the employer covenant, treating HE as a key ongoing economic sector, providing vital services that are always needed, and not merely in terms of the solvency of already-existing institutions.*
- 4. Do new tests of the reliance on covenant using consistent assumptions for the liabilities, including that the scheme remains open indefinitely (permitting long-term investment in high-income assets giving lower liabilities).*
- 5. Provide detailed estimates of liabilities/deficit on a 'best estimate' basis, assuming it remains open and no 'derisking'.*

Motion A, JEP must operate transparently, Newcastle University was moved by Bruce Baker (Newcastle University). Other speakers in the debate were Marion Hersh (Glasgow University) who **proposed remission of this motion, however this was LOST**. Justine Mercer (HEC / Midland-HE) also opposed the motion. **A proposal was placed from the floor to take point iii) in parts which conference agreed.**

Point iii) - revised terms of reference for the JEP incorporating these changes be submitted to the membership of branches in dispute for approval, before August, for approval and if that approval be not granted, that industrial action be announced for the beginning of the 2018-2019 academic year was LOST.

This motion was CARRIED AS AMENDED :

Conference notes:

- 1. The membership has had no role yet in shaping the structure or operation of the Joint Expert Panel*

Conference believes:

- a. The JEP is not a negotiation but a fact-finding exercise and should operate from a presumption of transparency rather than confidentiality*

Conference resolves:

to insist that

- i. all materials submitted to or produced by the JEP be put into the public domain immediately,*

- ii. *any such material deemed to require confidentiality shall be put into the public domain in redacted form with an explanation for the redaction,*

Motion B, On the Joint Expert Panel, University of Cambridge – was WITHDRAWN

1. *Conference notes that the membership has had no role yet in shaping the structure or operation of the Joint Expert Panel.*
2. *Conference believes the JEP is not a negotiation but a fact-finding exercise and is not legitimate in negotiating alternative scheme design options, including Collective Defined Contribution designs.*
3. *Conference believes that the JEP should operate from a presumption of transparency rather than confidentiality.*
4. *Conference notes that the JEP risks taking away from the hands of union members the democratic control over the dispute and risks co-opting our union into employers' positions.*

Hence conference resolves to insist that all materials submitted to or produced by the JEP be made available to members of USS immediately, and the terms of reference for the JEP are modified accordingly and submitted to the membership of branches in dispute before August for approval.

Motion C, JEP abstention from discussions of scheme design options including CDC, University of Sussex, was moved by Andrew Chitty (University of Sussex). David Watts (University of Aberdeen) opposed the motion. **The motion was subsequently CARRIED :**

Conference notes that the UUK offer of 23 March of a JEP, which UCU members voted to accept, stated that the remit of the JEP was to agree principles to underpin the valuation of the USS fund. It proposed that UUK and UCU would continue discussion on 'alternative scheme design options' but that this would happen 'alongside the work of the panel'.

In line with this stated remit, conference calls on the UCU-nominated members of the JEP to limit themselves to discussions on the methodology of the valuation of the USS fund, and to abstain from all discussions of alternative scheme design options, including Collective Defined Contribution designs.

We call on the SWG to request the same abstention of the UCU-nominated members of the JEP.

Motion D, Transparency and Reporting of Joint Expert Panel, University of Strathclyde was moved by Francesco Sindico (University of Strathclyde) who proposed that the motion be taken in parts. **This was agreed.** The motion was not opposed following which **Motion D was CARRIED :**

Conference notes that ordinary UCU members have not yet had input into the terms of reference for, or reporting mechanisms of, the Joint expert panel (JEP).

Conference resolves that:

1. *terms of reference for JEP are revised to insist on transparency as a default for the panel, and that a clear indication and explanation of where this transparency is not afforded, delayed or obstructed by any member is required*
2. *a clear mechanism is established for JEP reporting to the membership via the USS dispute committee established from the Higher Education Sector Conference, with a*

first report made available to members no later than October 2018 and a substantial indicative report by the end of the year.

Motion E, Member feedback to JEP, University of Newcastle was moved by Geoff Abbott (Newcastle University). Adam Ozanne (University of Manchester / HEC) opposed the motion. The Chair asked conference to note that point iii) of the motion will fall as a result of the vote result of Motion A :

point iii) – *revised terms of reference for the JEP incorporating these changes be submitted to the membership of branches in dispute for approval, before August, for approval and if that approval be not granted that industrial action be announced for the beginning of the 2018-2019 academic year - **FELL***

Motion E was CARRIED as amended :

Conference notes

1. *the membership has had no role yet in shaping the structure or operation of the Joint Expert Panel*

Conference believes

- a. *that the JEP must have a formal mechanism to accept feedback on its operations as it is working*

Conference resolves

- i. *that UCU members be provided immediately with a mechanism for submitting their views on the work of the JEP and the objects of the JEP's discussion*
- ii. *that the JEP formally acknowledge receipt of, discuss, and formally respond to all such submissions in a timely manner*

Motion 10, Democracy and transparency in ongoing industrial action, University of Liverpool was moved by Anthony O'Hanlon, University of Liverpool. Points of information were raised on this motion. Speakers in the debate were Sam Morecroft (University of Sheffield), Ryan Prout (Cardiff University), Justine Mercer (HEC and Midlands-HE), Glyn Heath (University of Salford). The Chair responded to points of information on points i, ii, and iii of the motion. The proposal to take the motion in parts was not approved. **Following a vote count, this motion was CARRIED :**

Conference notes:

1. *The decision not to give representatives a vote on the UUK proposal at the 28 March USS meeting held at Carlow Street exposed our Union's democratic deficit*
2. *The subsequent claim made by the general secretary (GS) that the majority of branch representatives wanted an immediate ballot of members*

Conference believes:

- a. *A member-led union requires a democratic and transparent decision-making process, both in the USS and any future disputes*

Conference resolves:

- i. *that results of the April 2018 consultative ballot to suspend action be published and broken down branch by branch*
- ii. *that the rules around calling notices for branch meetings be suspended during industrial action*
- iii. *that all key decisions in representative meetings end with a show of hands vote, the result of which should inform the vote of the Higher Education Committee to provide greater representation of the views of the wider membership.*

Motion 11, Handling of employer offers during disputes, University of Oxford was moved by Jay John John (University of Oxford) was not opposed and CARRIED :

Conference notes:

- 1. *Difficulties arising during the USS dispute due to limited time for discussion and consultation.*
- 2. *The improvements to our union's handling of disputes mandated by Congress 2018's motion 9.*

Building on this, conference resolves that:

- a. *During pensions, pay and other disputes, ballot text will be circulated to branch officers at least 3 working days in advance of the ballot going live.*
- b. *In order to provide flexibility to our national negotiators, this timeframe may exceptionally be reduced to 1 working day, if a majority of our national negotiators so vote.*

Motion 12, Dispute Committee terms of reference, Goldsmiths University of London was moved by Marian Carty (Goldsmiths University of London). The mover of the motion proposed that the second paragraph of the motion be withdrawn. It was further proposed that this paragraph be voted on separately and this **was accepted** by conference. David Watts (University of Aberdeen) spoke against the motion.

Paragraph 2 was lost :

HESC believes that membership of the USS dispute committee should be based upon the membership criteria used for the recent Industrial Action Commission (but for USS institutions) and reflect the diversity of perspectives taken by branches in relation to employer offers in the dispute thus far.

The motion was CARRIED AS AMENDED :

This Special HESC notes the passing of HE13 on 31 May 2018 that resolved to establish a national USS dispute committee (USSDC) composed of HESC delegates from USS branches in order to empower members in strategic discussions.

HESC further believes that any proposed ballot text on a future employer offer concerning USS has to be approved by the dispute committee before it is put to members.

HESC mandates the HEC when it meets on 29 June 2018 to agree a provisional timetable of meetings commensurate with the meetings of the JEP and communicate this, and the election procedure, to USSDC branches within 14 days.

Motion 13, USS voting rights of post-92 members and representatives, University of Sunderland was not moved and subsequently FELL :

HESC notes:

1. *UCU currently has USS collective bargaining rights only in pre-1992 institutions*
2. *Post-1992 UCU members in USS have been denied a voice in the USS pension dispute and are disenfranchised from voting on USS decision-making, including industrial action*
3. *UCU still has a job to do in the ongoing USS dispute and we believe that continued exclusion of post-1992 USS members from UCU decision-making is unfair, and is contrary to the ethos of a Union that believes in equality*
4. *Voting on USS matters has been restricted to scheme members*

HESC resolves to:

- a. *Call on the NEC to investigate necessary legal processes that would need to be effected to enable post-1992 USS members to have an individual vote on USS matters.*
- b. *Enable branch delegates and other elected representatives to vote on USS matters where their branch or constituency has USS members, regardless of whether they themselves are in USS.*

Motion 14, USS members in post-92 Universities, University of Brighton (Falmer), University of Brighton (Mouselcoomb) was moved by Mark Abel (University of Brighton). Denis Nicole (Southampton University) and Sean Wallis (UCL) raised point of information which were clarified. **The motion was CARRIED :**

HESC notes that some staff in post 92 universities are members of USS. While these staff have not been involved in industrial action in the USS dispute, UCU needs to find means of informing them regularly of developments in USS pensions issues and, where feasible, involving them in the campaign to defend USS pensions.

Furthermore UCU recognises the need to identify and quantify the extent of USS membership in post 92 universities and TPS membership in pre-92 universities.

HESC calls upon HEC:

1. *to take active measures to identify USS members in post 92, e.g. through adding pension scheme membership to UCU membership records,*
2. *contact USS members in post 92 about developments in USS pensions,*
3. *give them opportunities to be engaged in campaigning work to defend USS pensions,*
4. *give them a consultative voice in matters related to USS pensions.*

Motion 15, Call for resignation of USS CEO, University of Glasgow was moved by Marion Hersh. Renee Prendergast spoke in the debate. **The motion was CARRIED**

Conference deplores the role of the USS Chief Executive Officer in encouraging the undermining of our pensions and provoking the most sustained and disruptive industrial action in Higher Education history, including by:

1. *Insisting on an inappropriate valuation approach and recklessly prudent assumptions*
2. *Moving from the September to November technical provisions,*
3. *A lack of flexibility in the implementation of the valuation deadlines and imposition of rule 74.6, thereby undermining the work of the Joint Expert Panel.*

Conference calls for the resignation of the CEO of USS.

3.1 Due to time limits, the Chair proposed remission of the following motions to HEC. A proposal to suspend the Standing Orders to continue with the business on the agenda was **not approved** by the Chair and the Chair gave an explanation to conference for this ruling.

3.2 An extensive debate on the proposal to remit motions not taken to the HEC followed. Deepa Driver (University of Reading), Carlo Morelli (Dundee University), Michael Carley (University of Bath), Sam Morecroft (University of Sheffield), Brian Garvey (University of Strathclyde), Marion Hersh (University of Glasgow) spoke in the debate.

3.3 A vote followed and **MOTIONS 16 – 21 were REMITTED** (42 (in favour) / 0 (against) and 72 (abstentions)

(Note - motion 19: The University of Strathclyde made a proposal to withdraw motion 19 'No assumption of pensions deficit or detriment' and the Chair advised to write to the HEC with this request)

Motion 16, COMPOSITE Casualised Staff pensions, Goldsmiths University of London, University of Dundee

Conference notes casualised staff:

1. *are often barred from the right to join USS by their employer*
2. *have poor pension prospects due to lack of alternative pension provision*

Conference resolves:

- a. *To demand in our pay campaigns equal access to pensions for casualised staff.*
- b. *To ensure all grades of academic related, teaching and research staff have access to the USS pension scheme.*
- c. *To put a rule change through the JNC to ensure that casualised staff retain existing pension rights during periods of a break in service without needing to make contributions.*

Motion 17, Victimisation of Striking Members in the USS Dispute, University of Salford

HE Sector Conference congratulates members in the successful strike action in the USS Pensions' dispute and notes that members have been victimised during and subsequent to the strike. Members have been disproportionately sanctioned for minor breaches of policies or disproportionately selected for redundancy.

HE Sector Conference demands that agreements negotiated by UCU's negotiators include a clause whereby:

1. *During talks and up to and including agreement there shall be no victimisation in any form against those who have engaged in lawful strike action on behalf of their trade union*
2. *UCU will engage in an intensive campaign against any Employer that victimises UCU members in any form or attempts to impose rescheduling of work upon members.*
3. *Any Employer that victimises UCU members in any form or attempts to impose rescheduling of work will also be subject to academic boycott and censure (Grey listing)*

Motion 18, Possible future withdrawal from USS pension scheme by Employers, University of Salford

Possible future withdrawal from USS pension scheme by Employers.

Northwest Regional UCU are aware of at least one pre 92 employer considering leaving the USS pension scheme, citing the possible increased costs of the scheme.

HE Sector Conference demands that UCU engages in the strongest way possible against any employer, who withdraws from USS.

HE Sector Conference believes that a National response from UCU should include the following:

- 1. National Campaign against the offending Institution*
- 2. Immediate academic Boycott and Censure/Grey listing of the offending institution.*

HE Sector Conference demands that this response should be made clear to USS negotiating team in negotiations.

Motion 19, No assumption of pensions deficit or detriment, University of Strathclyde

Conference notes that a deficit in the USS pension scheme cannot be assumed, that the previous reduced contributions made into the pension scheme by employers relative to employees amount to some £7billion.

Conference resolves:

- 1. that UCU insists on maintaining the defined benefit status quo for as long as the JEP requires to complete its review*
- 2. should the result of JEP indicate a deficit there should be no detriment to current pensions before the employers have recognised, accounted for, and addressed the impact of reduced contributions.*

Motion 20, Campaigning for DB pensions as the best social pension provision, University of Leeds

Conference notes:

- 1. our successful industrial action defended the principle of Defined Benefit (DB) pensions, challenging political orthodoxy to accept DB pensions were "unaffordable"*
- 2. the current government is weak*
- 3. widespread criticism of university leaders for their enrichment*
- 4. pensions are deferred wages, thus increased employee pension contributions are a de facto pay cut.*
- 5. Labour Party policy has shifted from solely promoting Defined Contribution (DC) Pensions towards support for Defined Benefit pensions.*

Conference believes:

- a. the best social pension provision is DB*

Conference resolves:

- ii. to campaign for DB pensions within and without the labour movement, launching via a national trade union conference on the future of pension provision in Britain, together with advocates of DB pension schemes*
- iii. to work with all relevant political parties, calling them to advocate for collective provision of DB pensions*
- iv. any increase in employee pension payments should be compensated for in future pay settlements.*

Motion 21, Windfall from employers' USS contribution holiday, University of Sussex

Conference notes that between January 1997 and October 2009, while employees' USS contributions remained at 6.35% of salaries, the employer contribution was reduced from 18.55 to 14%. In 1999, USS actuarial estimates indicated this decrease in employer contributions would result in a shortfall of £561m that would be made up from the USS fund's surplus. In October 2009 contributions were raised back to 16% and in April 2016 to 18%. It has been calculated that the total savings to employers, relative to what they would have paid if they had continued to contribute in proportion to employees, amounts to some £7bn.

Conference calls on UCU members of the USS JNC to demand that in the event of further requirement for increased contributions needed to eliminate any USS deficit, said contributions should be met entirely from employers, up to the total amount of savings mentioned above, plus accrued interest.